RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 1 3 2006

Amendment under 37 CFR § 1.116 Application No. 10/780,701 Attorney Docket No. 042113

REMARKS

Rejections under 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7-21 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite because of lack of proper antecedent basis.

Claim 1 has been amended to give the proper antecedent basis. Thus, the rejection has

been overcome.

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9 and 13-16 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious

over Matsunaga (U.S. Patent No. 6,670,710) in view of Nakajima et al. (U.S. Patent

Application Publication No. 2003/0230809).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "said pillar being provided on a device isolation

structure on said substrate."

By providing the pillar on the device isolation structure, the stress applied to the pillar via

the electrode pad does not cause any adversary effect on the operational characteristics of the

semiconductor device. In contrast, where the pillar is provided on an active part of the

semiconductor device such as a diffusion region, the electrode pad causes disadvantageous effect

on the operational characteristics of the semiconductor device.

Page 10

PAGE 11/13 \* RCVD AT 9/13/2006 3:37:03 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/11 \* DNIS:2738300 \* CSID:202 822 1111 \* DURATION (mm-ss):03-00

09/13/2006 14:45 FAX 202 822 1111 WESTERMAN HATTORI

Ø 012/013

Amendment under 37 CFR § 1.116

Application No. 10/780,701

Attorney Docket No. 042113

Thus, the device isolation structure of the present invention provides a rigid support to the

pillar in view of the large elastic modulus of the thick oxide film forming the device isolation

structure. Neither Matsunaga nor Nakajima et al teaches or suggests the foregoing feature of

amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Matsunaga and Nakajima

et al. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7-9 and 13-16, all directly or indirectly depending from claim 1, also

patentably distinguish over Matsunaga and Nakajima et al for at least the same reasons.

Therefore, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants

submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request

such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to

expedite the disposition of this case.

Page 11

Amendment under 37 CFR § 1.116 Application No. 10/780,701 Attorney Docket No. 042113

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Sadao Kinashi Attorney for Applicants Registration No. 48,075

Telephone: (202) 822-1100 Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SK/ar

Q:\2004\042113\042113 amd 2.doc